



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,756	03/22/2004	Dimitri Wasil Kemper	P/334-197	2432
2352	7590	11/15/2007		
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 100368403				
			EXAMINER SCHNEIDER, CRAIG M	
			ART UNIT 3753	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/15/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

CT

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/806,756	KEMPER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Craig M. Schneider	3753	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Craig M. Schneider.

(3) George Brieger.

(2) Ramesh Krishnamurthy.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 09 November 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 7.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lachaux and Boke.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


RAMESH KIRSHNAMURTHY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant sent in an interview agenda (see attached). The applicant argued that the Boke reference did not satisfy the claim language of the auxiliary valve being between a tank and an inlet. The examiner explained to the applicant that the Boke reference did have a tank side (14') of the auxiliary valve (42) and that since the Boke reference taught to relieve the excessive pressure from the tank to the inlet that it would have been obvious to combine Lachaux and Boke in order to provide an additional valve to relieve excessive pressure from the tank. The examiner suggested removing "/or" from line 11 of claim 7 because it would further define the claimed invention and would subject the rejection of claim 7 to further consideration and search. The applicant agreed to consider the proposed amendment and discuss with the client and file a response in due course.

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant sent in an interview agenda (see attached). The applicant argued that the Boke reference did not satisfy the claim language of the auxiliary valve being between a tank and an inlet. The examiner explained to the applicant that the Boke reference did have a tank side (14') of the auxiliary valve (42) and that since the Boke reference taught to relieve the excessive pressure from the tank to the inlet that it would have been obvious to combine Lachaux and Boke in order to provide an additional valve to relieve excessive pressure from the tank. The examiner suggested removing "/or" from line 11 of claim 7 because it would further define the claimed invention and would subject the rejection of claim 7 to further consideration and search.

P/334-197

Patent Application Serial No.: 10/806,756

Examiner: Craig M. SCHNEIDER

Confirmation No.: 2432

Group Art Unit: 3753

Applicant's Representative: George Brieger, Reg. No. 52,652

PROPOSED AGENDA FOR EXAMINER INTERVIEW*NOT FOR THE PERMANENT RECORD OF THE USPTO.**EXAMINER EYES ONLY. PLEASE DISCARD AFTER THE INTERVIEW.***I. Claim Language**

Claim 7 requires:

an expansion tank system operable to be connected to a pipe system, the expansion tank system comprising a tank configured for containing a liquid and/or a gas, and an additional valve positioned in the auxiliary channel formed to close off the auxiliary channel, the additional valve being formed to be closed during normal operation of the expansion tank when connected to the pipe system and to be opened when, during operation, a second overpressure exists in the tank greater than the overpressure which exists ex works.

II. The Cited Art

The Office Action acknowledges that the primary reference Lachaux does not disclose or suggest such an additional valve positioned in the auxiliary channel (Office Action, page 3). However, the Office Action cites the check valve 42' of Böke as corresponding to such an additional valve (Office Action, page 4 and page 5). The check valve 42' of Böke is designed such that:

In the case of a rapid increase in pressure in the outlet duct 14' with the dispensing valve closed and the solenoid valve closed, for example owing to an expansion of the fuel due to strong insolation [sunlight exposure] or due to a car running over

00882385.1

the petrol pump hose, fuel is allowed to get from the outlet duct 14' into the inlet duct 12' via the check valve 42' so as to prevent damage to the dispensing valve or the solenoid valve 10'. . . . [T]he check valve 42' is opened for so long until [sic] the pressure in the outlet duct 14' again decreases below a value predefined by the spring. This ensures that the pressure in the outlet duct 14' does not exceed a certain value.

(Böke, col. 4, lines 25-38.) Thus, Böke's check valve 42' is unrelated to overpressure existing in the tank, as required by claim 7. As discussed, Böke's check valve 42' is designed to deal with excessively high pressure in the inlet duct 12 (or 12') outside of the solenoid valve 10' of the petrol dispensing system.

Further, Lachaux and Böke do not disclose or suggest that the additional valve opens when the second overpressure existing in the tank is greater than the overpressure which exists ex works. That is, Lachaux and Böke do not disclose or suggest an additional valve designed to respond to a second overpressure in the tank greater than a first overpressure that exists in the tank. As discussed, Böke does not deal with the problem of overpressure existing in the tank.